

tion. In pointing out the peaceful and constitutional remedies—and he referred to none other—to which the States were authorized to resort on such occasions, he concludes by saying, that the Legislatures of the States might have made a direct representation to Congress, with a view to obtain a rescinding of the two offensive acts, or they might have represented to their respective Senators in Congress their wish that two-thirds thereof would propose any explanatory amendment to the Constitution; or two-thirds of themselves, if such had been their option, might, by an application to Congress, have obtained a Convention for the very same object. This is the very course which I earnestly recommend, in order to obtain an explanatory amendment of the Constitution on the subject of slavery. This might originate with Congress or the State Legislatures, as may be deemed most advisable to attain the object. The explanatory amendment might be confined to the final settlement of the true construction of the Constitution on three special points:—First, an express recognition of the right of property in slaves in the States where it now exists, or may hereafter exist. Second, the duty of protecting this right in all the common territories throughout their territorial existence, and until they shall be admitted as States into the Union, with or without slavery, as their Constitutions may prescribe. Third, a like recognition of the right of the master to his slave, who has escaped from one State to another, to be restored, and delivered up to him; and the validity of the Fugitive Slave Law, enacted for this purpose, together with a declaration that all State laws impairing or decreasing this right, are violations of the Constitution, consequently null and void.

APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT TO THE PEOPLE.
It may be objected, that this construction of the Constitution has already been settled by the Supreme Court of the United States, and what more ought to be required. The answer is, that a very large proportion of the people of the United States still controvert the correctness of this decision, and never will cease from agitation, nor admit its binding force until clearly established by the people of the several States in their sovereign character. Such an explanation would, it is believed, forever terminate the existing dissensions, and restore peace and harmony among the States. It ought not to be doubted that such an appeal to the arbitrament established by the Constitution itself, would be received with favor by all the States of the Confederacy. In any event it ought to be tried in a spirit of conciliation, before any of these States shall separate themselves from the Union.

SOME OTHER TROUBLES.

When I entered upon the duties of the Presidential office, the aspect neither of our foreign nor domestic affairs was at all satisfactory. We were involved in dangerous complications with several nations, and two of our territories were in a state of revolution against our Government; a restoration of the African slave trade had numerous and powerful advocates; unlawful military expeditions were countenanced by many of our citizens, and were suffered, in defiance of the efforts of our Government, to escape from our shores for the purpose of making war upon the unoffending people of neighboring Republics, with whom we were at peace.

A WOMAN'S POLITICS!

BY MRS. GEORGE WASHINGTON WELLS.

Yes, Mr. Crocus, I think it's full time you were home! I'd like to know where you've been all this time? Only to an Anti-Secession Meeting? What business is it of yours whether the South secedes or not? A pretty idea, that the poor women folks have to sit at home, crying their eyes out while you are hallooing yourself hoarse about panics and politics, and I don't know what else! The Personal Liberty Bill is in danger? Well, let it be in danger. Caleb Crocus's private opinions won't make much difference on the subject, I presume. The Personal Liberty Bill don't buy tea and sugar, at your grocery, I take it? People have a good deal too much personal liberty as it is—if it was a law keeping decent men at home with their wives at night, I should think differently! The Union is tottering to its foundation? Jeit! Well, if it can't keep itself up without your running to the tavern to put your shoulder under, I say, let it go! The base fire-eaters of South Carolina are undermining our Constitution? Indeed! I should suppose you were undermining yours by the looks of your nose! Pity the South Carolinians don't know Caleb Crocus's opinion of them. They'd appoint a day of fasting and humiliation, probably!

Don't tell me that I don't understand the weighty interests involved! I understand quite enough! Strange if I didn't, when you spend your whole time wrangling with drunken loafers and hurrahing at the silly speeches of some fool who is a degree more fanatical than even you! I haven't any patriotism! My husband has enough for both, I assume! I hear of nothing but national concessions, and compromises, and seceding, until I'm sick of the sound of them. Did you hear that clock strike, Mr. Crocus? Did you know that it was eleven o'clock, and that you ought to have been home four hours ago? No use turning the conversation to Old Abe! If Old Abe can't take care of the country without your help, he must be a poor stick! And, talking about sticks, there isn't a blessed kindling split for to-morrow! Who did you suppose was going to split them? Old Abe, I suppose? Or perhaps you were going to send up a committee from the tavern? You'll please go about it, as soon as convenient! I'm not going to sit up all night for you!

You want your supper? Well, I've wanted you any time these four hours. You needn't go prying into that cellar—you won't find anything to eat there. Where's the cold beef? The cold beef has seceded, Mr. Crocus! There's no use in banging that door, either. Keep your fingers out of that cake-sauce, unless you want 'em caught in the rat-trap. See what comes of staying out until eleven o'clock at night.

The next time you go to help save the Union, I'm going with you! It's very strange if a man's wife can't be a little patriotic, too! I might expand my mind vastly by the study of politics! Oh! I haven't any patience with the men! Crocus, you shan't stir out of the house to-morrow night! How will I help it? I'll hide your hat! You guess you can go without a hat? Then I'll hide your trousers!

I'm sure I shall dream of secession and Personal Liberty Bill to-night! It's enough to wear a woman out! Oh, dear! I wish there was no such thing as politics!

THE VOTE OF THE COUNTRY.—The whole number of votes cast is 4,500,000; of which Abraham Lincoln received 1,800,000; Stephen A. Douglas, 1,300,000; John C. Breckinridge, 800,000; and John Bell, 600,000.

NUMBER I.

Mr. Jones: I belong to that small and despicable political party of "Radical Abolitionists," which we, of Illinois, in the late Presidential election, correctly, as we hope, named "The True Democracy." Our motto is LIBERTY, EQUALITY, FRATERNITY. Whether we shall decree the name which we have chosen, is yet to be tested by our future devotion to the great cause of human rights. By human rights, I mean to include as the most important, the natural, inherent and absolutely sovereign right of every man and of every woman to self-government. If they possess this inherent right of self-government, there is then, of necessity, an end to the absurd and impudent claim for either the Federal or State Governments being, in any sense of the term, sovereign. And this brings me to the subject proposed for discussion in these essays, namely, the sovereignty of these confederated States, and their unquestionable right peacefully to secede from the Union.

I send you these essays for publication from a conviction that they will meet your approbation, and be given to your readers for their calm and candid consideration. I am led to this conclusion from the fact, that you are the only editor north of Mason and Dixon's line, (at least so far as my knowledge extends,) who, taking his stand upon the Declaration of American Independence, boldly avows the right of a State to secede from the Union, without incurring the guilt of treason and rebellion.

The subject of sovereignty is infinitely more important to the people of the several States than the question of who shall administer the federal government, because it underlies the whole superstructure of our complex, yet simple, system of federal and state governments. The terms, sovereignty, sovereign states, and popular sovereignty, are in every day use, and yet few of those who use these terms seem to have any definite idea of their meaning.

For instance, nearly everybody, in speaking of the states of this confederacy, call them "sovereign states," and yet they utterly demolish "state sovereignty" by admitting the "old federal" theory, that "each state expressly parted with so many powers as to constitute jointly with the other states a single nation."

Now it is clear that state and nation are convertible terms. How, then, could the "old thirteen states," after adopting the federal constitution, continue to be states, if "each state expressly parted with so many powers as to constitute jointly with the other states a single nation"? If a single "nation" was formed by the consolidation of the original thirteen states, then it is clear as the noon-day sun that ours is not a "confederacy of states," but a consolidated despotism. The term despotism is used because, if ours is a consolidated government, it is the most unequal and unjust imaginable, as will be shown in a future number.

In order to get a correct view of this question of "sovereignty," it is necessary to go back in history to the Declaration of Independence, which emphatically declares:

"That these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states; that they are also free from all allegiance to the British crown, and that they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and do all other acts and things, which independent states may of right do."

On the 4th of July, 1776, then, it is clear, that the colonies became "free and independent states," and consequently sovereign states. Two years later, in 1778, the states, by adopting the articles of the confederation, assert their sovereignty by declaring that "EACH STATE RETAINS ITS SOVEREIGNTY." Up, then, to the adoption of the federal constitution, it is undoubted that each state was a sovereign commonwealth, republic or nation.

Now where, when and how were the states, since that day, despoiled of their sovereignty? Notwithstanding the proof that the states have parted with their inherent sovereignty to the federal government, necessarily devolves on those who assert the claim, I will endeavor to prove the negative of their false position. The 10th article of the amendments to the federal constitution declares that "the powers not delegated to the United States, nor prohibited to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people."

Now no one will claim that sovereignty is among the expressly delegated powers, and it is absurd to claim that an attribute so essential to the very existence of the states has been delegated by implication. This, the most ardent "old federalists" would not claim. To obviate this difficulty, it is claimed that "sovereignty is divided between the states and the federal government, and that the allegiance of the citizens of the several states is due to the federal government, as well as to the state governments."

This doctrine of a divided sovereignty and a transfer of allegiance, either in whole or part, to the federal government was first authoritatively announced by General Jackson, in his proclamation of 1832. In this document, which he had no constitutional right to issue, Gen. Jackson says:

"Of this nature appears to be the assumed right of secession. It rests, as we have seen, on the alleged undivided sovereignty of the states, and on their having formed, in this sovereign capacity, a compact which is called the constitution. . . . The states severally have not retained their entire sovereignty. It has been shown that, in becoming parts of a nation, not members of a league, they surrendered many other essential parts of sovereignty. The right to make treaties; declare war; levy taxes; exercise exclusive judicial and legislative power—were all of them functions of sovereign power. The states, then, for all these important purposes were no longer sovereign. The allegiance of their citizens was transferred, in the first instance, to the government of the United States."

Now it is clear that if, on adopting the federal constitution, the states did not "retain their entire sovereignty," that they then absolutely ceased to be sovereign or supreme, in the legitimate meaning of the term, because sovereignty is of necessity indivisible—the term sovereign being, as every school-boy well knows, always in the superlative degree, and therefore incapable of being compared. This position will not be controverted. Again, if, on adopting the federal constitution the states actually "transferred the allegiance of their citizens to the government of the United States," allegiance can, by no possibility be due to any one of the states separately, and hence it is impossible for any one to commit treason against a state of this confederacy. This position will not be controverted.

It is freely granted that "the right to make treaties, declare war and levy taxes, are all of them functions of sovereign power," but it is by no means follows that the federal government, the agent, the mere creature of the states, spoken into

being by the fiat of their sovereign will, has thus become the unconscious recipient of their voluntarily surrendered sovereignty—the despotic master of their future destiny.

Reference is here made to Gen. Jackson's proclamation, because, with my democratic friends, he is good authority, and it can be shown that he was in error on this vital question of "state sovereignty," there will be no difficulty in meeting the positions of avowed federalists.

That this dangerous political heresy of a "divided sovereignty" was the invention of some of Gen. Jackson's wily "old federal" advisers, there can be no doubt. They well knew that his previous messages were ultra state right documents, and that their new idea of a "divided sovereignty" was the only way to win him over unsuspiciously to the side of the consolidationists.

In his first inaugural he thus emphatically asserts the sovereignty of the states:

"In such measures as I shall be called on to pursue, in regard to the rights of the separate states, I hope to be animated by a proper respect for these sovereign members of our union."

In his first annual message he says:

"The task devolves on me to present to you, as the federal legislature of twenty-four sovereign states and twelve millions of happy people, a view of our affairs. . . . I cannot, therefore, too strongly or too earnestly, for my own sense of its importance, warn you against all encroachments upon the legitimate sphere of state sovereignty. Sustained by its healthful and invigorating influence, the federal system can never fail."

In his second annual message he says:

"And I shall endeavor to avoid a repetition of what has already been urged—the importance of sustaining the state sovereignties as far as is consistent with the rightful action of the federal government."

In his fourth annual message he says:

"Believed by its protecting shield from the fears of war, and the apprehensions of oppression, the free enterprise of our citizens, aided by the state sovereignties, will work out improvements which cannot fail to demonstrate the great truth, that the people can govern themselves."

Any amount of such quotations could be given to show that Gen. Jackson, up to the issue of the proclamation, was an ultra democrat of the old Jefferson state rights school, but the above are amply sufficient.

I sign my name to these essays, because those who advocate unpopular doctines over a Social signature, are always said to be ashamed of their principles. Some of my old democratic friends in Ohio, may chance to see these views and exclaim, "Turncoat." All that I have to say in reply is, that being convinced of my error in endorsing the Fed. Constitution as a pro-slavery document, it would prove me false to that constitution, if I should (contrary to the views of Virginia in 1795, namely, that the Fed. Constitution is "limited to the plain sense of the instrument.") fail to pursue the policy of administering it as an anti-slavery document. This subject will be continued in a few more numbers.

B. G. WRIGHT.

RURAL, ILLINOIS, NOV. 1, 1860.

OBITUARY.

Departed this life in Salem, Cuyahoga Co., Ohio, December 1st, of Diphtheria, Emma L., only daughter of Levant and Lervania Johnson, aged Seven years and Three months.

Oh! never more her soft blue eyes
Will meet the gaze of ours,
Oh! never more her red lips breathe
The fragrance of the flowers.

Oh! never more her tiny clasp
Around our necks be drawn,
Nor music of her angel voice
Awake us at the dawn.

'Tis ever thus—'tis ever thus, with creatures heart-
Too finely framed to bide the brunt more earthly
nares tear:
A little while they dwell with us, blessed minis-
ters of love;
Then spread the wings we had not seen, and seek
their home above.

Died, in Mogadore, Summit Co., O., on the 27th of November, Henry H. Thurston, aged Twenty years.

A morning sun, bright and cloudless, yet before reaching its meridian altitude eclipsed by the pale shadow of Death. In his loss we mourn a noble hearted youth; one socially, morally, and intellectually of highest promise. Honesty and Justice were polar stars, ever bright in the firmament of his course. His question was not, Will it be popular? Is it expedient? but, Is it right? Early in youth was developed in him an earnest love for the Good and True, and his first views of life were prompted by Liberty, Duty, and the great Human Brotherhood. Such a youth is the noblest gift that can be bestowed on any community, or indeed any generation, for we cannot speak too highly of him for whom every body has a word of commendation. To such a one we should sooner erect a monument than to the hero of an hundred battles; and what fitter or nobler monument could we have, than one of faithful young hearts consecrated anew to the cause of Truth, of Duty, and of Right!

The Anti-Slavery Bugle.
"PROVIDENCE HAS MADE ME AN ACTOR AND SLAVEY AN OUTLAW"—John Brown of Ossawatimie.
SALEM, OHIO, DECEMBER 15, 1860.
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
A special meeting of the Committee will be held on Thursday evening, December the 20th, at 7 o'clock. A full attendance is desirable.
PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.
We have copied a considerable portion of this document, seeing that the views therein presented are especially important as coming from the acknowledged head of the Federal government. The poor old man is to be pitied, for he feels the responsibilities of his position, and is conscious of his utter inability to act—contending that Secession is wrong, and admitting there is no way to prevent it. He may yet have the honor of being the last President of the United States, as Washington had of being the first. If the South waits for Lincoln's inauguration, and an unconstitutional overt act of his administration, then verily, she is more verdant than vallant.

BOSTON IN 1860.

The disunion demonstrations at the South, would naturally produce union saving demonstrations at the North; hence, while Charleston in South Carolina is denouncing the Union, Boston, in Massachusetts, is existing it. The one mob abolitionists because they are opposed to slavery; and the other, because the agitation of the slavery question disturbs the equilibrium of the Union. Neither manifestation should be objected to, so long as the feeling exists; better it should be acted out, than be repressed to rankle and gather new strength.

While secession on the part of the South will in all probability involve no governmental conflict, it will doubtless be accompanied and followed, as it has been preceded by many instances of individual violence, by Lynch law in the South, and mob law in the North. The demonstration in Boston on the 3rd of December, though differing in details was the same in spirit as that which ruled there twenty-five years ago. It is true, the population of Boston and of the State possesses far more anti-slavery intelligence now than it did then, but not enough, we fear, to stand by and defend the freedom of speech except within certain limitations; and in the manifestations on the occasion referred to, there can readily be identified the mobocratic respectability and standing which triumphed there a quarter of a century since, and the same official subservility which at that time disgraced the city.

When in '38 Philadelphia burned Pennsylvania Hall, and her Mayor Swift and his police played into the hands of the mob, we feared it would require a miracle to make her a decent city, and to efface the stigma which 1838 had burned into her history. But when we contrast the action of Mayor Henry, who last winter so nobly stood by George W. Curtis and the freedom of speech, triumphantly defending his right to be heard, and catching and enjoining the sons of Philadelphia abolitionists who attempted to apply the gag, with that of Mayor Lincoln of Boston, who suffered a Union mob to plunder the abolitionists of their rented hall, hurl at the colored men in attendance epithets coined in the lowest mire of negro hatred, and whose highest idea of official duty was to close the hall after the mobocrats had held their meeting, thus virtually applying the gag, and doing what the mobocrats themselves were unable to do: when we contrast the conduct of these two officials, we are almost tempted to believe that Philadelphia will enter into the kingdom of Anti-Slavery before Boston is within sight of the promised land.

We have elsewhere given the resolutions of the mobocrats led on by Richard S. Fay and J. Murray Howe, and also those adopted by the meeting held by the Abolitionists in Martin's Church, belonging to a colored congregation, and which meeting, it seems, the police did guard against serious interruptions, but did not however, protect the colored citizens of Boston on their way home, nor did they prevent the destruction of property belonging to, or occupied by that class of community.

Surely the heart of Carolina will be made glad by these mobocratic achievements, for Boston has won from the South the meed of "Well done, good and faithful servant."

BOSTON AND THE MOB.

[After the union mobocrats had taken forcible possession of the hall in which Redpath and others had called their meeting, they passed the following resolutions:]

Whereas, it is fitting upon the occasion of the Anniversary of the execution of John Brown for his piratical and bloody attempts to create an insurrection among the slaves of the State of Virginia, for the people of this Commonwealth to assemble and express their horror of the man, and of the principles which led to the foray—

Therefore, it is resolved,

1. That no virtuous and law-abiding citizen of this Commonwealth ought to countenance, sympathize or hold communion with any man who believes that John Brown and his aiders and abettors in that nefarious enterprise were right, in any sense of that word.

2. That the present perilous juncture in our political affairs, in which our existence as a nation is imperilled, requires of every citizen who loves his country to come forward, and to express his sense of the value of the Union, alike important to the free labor of the North, the slave labor of the South, and to the interests of the commerce, manufactures and agriculture of the world.

3. That we tender to our brethren in Virginia our warmest thanks for the conservative spirit they have manifested, notwithstanding the unprovoked and lawless attack made upon them by John Brown and his associates, acting, if not with the connivance, at least with the sympathy of a few fanatics from the North and States, and that we hope they will still continue to aid in opposing the fanaticism which is even now attempting to subvert the constitution and the Union.

4. That the people of this city have submitted too long in allowing irresponsible persons and political demagogues of every description to hold public meetings to disturb the public peace and misrepresent us abroad; they have become a nuisance, which, in self-defense, we are determined shall henceforward be summarily abated.

5. That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each of the persons named in the call for this meeting.

[The abolitionists, having been robbed of their hall, gave notice that they would meet in the evening in Martin's Church. During the afternoon the following poster appeared in the streets:]

"CITIZENS OF BOSTON!—The sympathizers of JOHN BROWN say they will hold a meeting at Martin's Church, in Joy Street, this Monday evening, Dec. 31. UNION MEN, SHALL IT BE ALLOWED? LET BOSTON SPEAK!"

[Indications of an increasing mob being good, the Mayor ordered the Second Battalion of Infantry and the National Lancers to hold themselves in readiness for instant duty. The abolitionists met in Joy St. Church, and the following are the resolutions they adopted.]

Resolved, That the riotous interruption of a meeting this day assembled in Tremont Temple, to discuss the question of the Abolition of Slavery, by a mob of merchants and other evil-disposed persons, headed by R. S. Fay, Esq., who organized their raid outside, and stole into the hall while the meeting was being organized, trampling on the rights of those who had hired the hall, and called it, was a mean and unconstitutional, as well as an unmanly act, unworthy of Massachusetts and even Boston.

Resolved, That this cowardly act betrays the unobscured fact that these "gentlemen of property and standing" have no arguments satisfactory even to themselves to urge against those who called the meeting, and who are the practical friends of free speech.

Resolved, That the efforts of the mob to break up the meeting, in our opinion, would have been successful but for the Mayor's command to remove

the friends of order and the originators of the meeting from the platform—by which not he became the real ringleader of the mob, and stands responsible for the destruction of the meeting.

COMPROMISE.

There is evidently a disposition upon the part of some of the prominent men at Washington in both parties to grind out another tune upon the old organ of Compromise. They see that the people of the South are indisposed to yield, and many of them unwilling to consent to any delay with the hope of an adjustment of sectional quarrels, yet these proposed pacificators hope to gain time, trusting that a truce may be patched up that will carry the Federal Union safely beyond the present crisis. The talk concerning Secession—both in Congress and out of Congress—is not now as formerly, when it was regarded as something afar off and indefinite, though fearful; it has now become a reality, whose presence is felt, and whose power is acknowledged; and conciliation and compromise are admitted to be the only available means, by which it can possibly be averted. Such talk as Senator Wilson gave in his seat not long since, advocating the hanging of Disunionists whether at the North or at the South, would be regarded now as an extremely bad taste, and would hardly be tolerated even by those who applauded it then.

The refusal of the Vermont Legislature, by a vote of two to one, to repeal her personal liberty bill, is rather a poor test for conciliation to preach from. And as Congress has no power to repeal any state law, nor has any convention of States called by Congress, all that these peace makers can give the South in the form of Soothing Syrup, is the expression of a desire that something may be done, and proposals for calling an adjusting convention, whose gigantic labors would not even bring forth a mouse.

As the North will not dissolve the Union in the name of Liberty, we are ready for the South to do it in the name of Slavery, believing that such a movement would eventuate in a benefit to both North and South, and to the master and his slave.

SAVED BY FAITH, NOT BY WORKS.

There are points of resemblance between the politics and religion of the land that would seem sufficiently prominent to be evident to every beholder. To mention their resemblance in two particulars, for instance, both are pre-slavery, and both teach the orthodox doctrine that salvation is won by Faith, and not by Works. This last named truth we took it for granted every politician rightly believed, and hence our surprise in seeing an article in the *McConnellsville Enquirer*, complaining of the dismission of two lock-tenders on the Liver Improvement in that neighborhood, the said lock-tenders being capable men, charged with no neglect of duty, and guilty of no other crime than voting a Democratic ticket.

"That tells the whole story," as somebody—we forget who—used to say. Has not the editor of the *Enquirer* been in politics long enough to learn that no official work, however faithfully performed, can save the holder of office? Has he not yet learned that Republicans, as well as Democrats practically teach the doctrine that it is by Grace of the administration, through Faith in the dominant party, political office holders are saved.

Work! Fidelity! Competency! Honesty! what are they but delusive words which no official can safely rely upon in the hour of his extremity.

HOME GUARDS & HOME PROTECTION.

This is the very significant caption of an article in the *Tuskegee (Alabama) Republican*, in which it is proposed to raise a military company to protect their homes against the negroes. Has Alabama disposed of all her happy and contented slaves who would not take their freedom if they could get it? Has she sold off those glorious fellows whose attachment to their masters is so strong they would lay down their lives to defend them? What has become of that population that was so faithful and so trustworthy that even the honied words of the abolitionists could not avert them from the line of strict duty?

JOHN BROWN AGAIN.

The *Chester County Times* gives a detailed account of the trial of two men, who, last March, kidnapped a John Brown from Lancaster County, Pa., and offered him for sale in Baltimore. They were found guilty, and each sentenced to five years imprisonment.

We believe that the men who, in October of last year, kidnapped a John Brown from Harper's Ferry, Va., have not yet been brought to trial, nor received the punishment they so richly deserve.

OH!

Henry Ward Beecher says there are three grand events in American history.

1st. The landing of the Pilgrim Fathers, December 22nd, 1620!

2nd. THE ISSUING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, JULY 4th, 1776!!

3rd. THE ELECTION OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN, NOVEMBER 6th, 1860!!!

"At the late vote on annexation in Naples, a woman, who from her heism, has become famous, La Sangiannara, claimed the right to vote. She is the leader of a large district in the city of Naples, and fought at Capua. Having borne arms, she was adjudged to have gained the right of suffrage."

The above is going the rounds of the papers, yet strange to say, no one that we have seen has ventured to hint that La Sangiannara, was out of her proper sphere upon the field of carnage, nor is any intimation given that the exercise of the elective franchise in her case was unwomanly, and calculated to degrade and demoralize the race. Perhaps it had been an American mother instead of an Italian Heroine who insisted upon her right to vote, plain Ann Brown, instead of famous La Sangiannara, the ridicule and satire which is now silent, would have found active employment. "Circumstances alter cases," used to be one of our school writing copies, and we see its truthfulness illustrated every day.

The Hon. R. B. Kett of South Carolina said the other day in his Charleston speech:

"They have elected a Southern renegade—spewed out of the bosom of Kentucky into Illinois—and a Northern whitewashed or octoroon mulatto, to be President and Vice President of the United States."

It would have spoiled Mr. Rhet's rhetoric somewhat had he said Lincoln was spewed out of the stomach of Kentucky; yet we believe when nature resorts to that convulsive movement she generally uses the stomach, rather than the bosom to effect its ends.

AGRICULTURAL PAPERS.

Have become a necessity with the people, and the increased demand for them has greatly multiplied their number, and improved their character. With so many to choose from as is now offered, it would be strange if the tastes of all could not be suited.

Thinking it possible that some of our readers who do may wish another, we shall name those with which we have become somewhat acquainted through the medium of exchange. First, the *AMERICAN AGRICULTURIST*, a large, handsome and interesting monthly, published in both the English and German language, by Orange Judd, New York. Price, for either edition \$1.00. The *GENESSEE FARMER*, published at Rochester, N. Y., a smaller monthly than the *Agriculturist*, is furnished at 50 cents. This paper is edited with ability, and no subscriber would regret his investment. The *OHIO CULTIVATOR*, published monthly at Columbus; subscription 50 cents. The *Cultivator* is as well known in Ohio and in other portions of the West, that to say more would be like introducing an old acquaintance. The *HOUSE AND GARDEN* is also published monthly by Thos. Brown, Cleveland, at 50 cents. This paper has just commenced its existence, and although in a previous number we notified our readers of the editor's promises, not having been favored with any copies, we cannot personally speak of his performance. Mr. Brown also issues the *OHIO FARMER*, a weekly, which comes at \$1.50, and is well known and popular with the people of this State. T. B. Miner & Son, Utica, N. Y., furnish the *RURAL AMERICAN*, another weekly, at the same price. Those who wish particulars of the American are referred to the prospectus of the publishers in another column. The editor of the *Cultivator* proposes to issue a weekly about the commencement of the year, to be called *FIELD NOTES*, price \$2.00. Specimen numbers of any of these papers may be procured on application to their several publishers.

CHILDREN'S PAPERS.

Parents should not neglect to furnish these desirable educational agencies to their children; they are as necessary as school books, and far more attractive.

MERRY'S *MUSEUM*, which is published monthly by J. N. Stearns & Co., 116 Nassau St. New York, has been so long before the public that the boys and girls who read its first numbers, are now of the men and women who compose this working world. It has kept step with the progress of the age, and each year improvements are made and additional inducements offered to subscribers. It is furnished for \$1.00 per year, each number comprising a pamphlet of some 26 pages, and containing copious pictorial illustrations.

Grace Greenwood's *LITTLE PILGRIM* with his budget of word pictures and pencil sketches always receives a cordial welcome from the little ones on whom he makes his monthly calls. The paper has now been seven years before the public, and whether or not it has grown in grace, it has certainly grown in reputation and in favor with community. The volume for the coming year is rich in promise, and will doubtless be in fruition. The price is but 50 cents per annum, which amounts remitted to Leander K. Lippencott, 319 Walnut St. Philadelphia, will secure a dozen calls from the Pilgrim. Those who wish to see a specimen copy can procure it by applying to the publisher as above.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY.—Our subscribers have had an opportunity to examine the Prospectus of the Monthly, for the 7th volume, and if they have not read it, they had better turn to the column in which it stands. We will club the Bugle and the Monthly for \$3.50, subscribers paying their own postage. Those who wish to receive it on these terms had better send in their names and money without delay.

THE HOME JOURNAL.—Read what the publishers say respecting the forthcoming volume of this weekly. The Journal has really no competitors, it is one by itself, and the talent and text of its editors will ever render it popular among those to whose patronage it looks for support.

OTHER WORK TO DO FIRST.—The European correspondent of the *Anti-Slavery Standard*—Miss Martineau—in considering the good which American and England united might do, says,

"In cordial union, you and we might soon bring about the abolition of slavery in Cuba, and of the slave trade in Africa, and infuse a strength into all liberal elements in European countries which would secure the victory to the right."

We suspect that if this government should exert its power in striving to effect the abolition of slavery in Cuba, the people of that island would respond in plain English by this quotation from Whitier:—

"Go, loose your fettered slaves at home, Then turn, and ask the like of us."

And if they were inclined to add scripture to poetry, they might find a significant and appropriate question in the following passage: "Thou that sayest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?"

A SET OF HEADACHES.—An advertiser of quack medicine says, "Henry Clay, and a long list of his distinguished contemporaries in the United States Senate and House of Representatives, have given the strongest testimony of the benefits which they derived from the use of Wilson's Headache Pills."

History has much cause to be grateful to the writer of the above for bringing to light the twofold fact, that Henry Clay and a long list of his distinguished contemporaries in both the Senate and the House were grievously afflicted with headache, and were also greatly benefited by the use of "Wilson's Headache Pills."

How stand the present House and Senate? Do they furnish a long list of distinguished members who have the headache? And tell us, oh, tell us, we beseech you, ye vendors of quack nostrums, do they use, and are they benefited by "Wilson's Headache Pills?"